



Part of FIG. 2 of Stevens

First, Stevens has no guide tube at its distal end. The element (14) that the Examiner contends as being the claimed guide tube is actually the catheter's distal tip (14) which is not shown as a tube and not even comparable to a tube, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 above.

Second, even if tip (14) were a tube, it does not extend through opening (20), as contended by the Examiner, as clearly evident from FIG. 2 above. Tip (14) merely is received in the end of Steven's tube (74) to provide the distal tip of Stevens catheter, and cannot be said to extend through the same opening (20) as used in Stevens to receive deposits in cavity (50) (see column 3, lines 59-60). Rather, it appears that the Examiner may be instead contending that the end of tube (74) represents the opening of Claim 1 (rather than the side opening (20) of such tube), given that the end of tube (74) is the only opening that tip (14) extending through in FIG. 2. However, the end of tube (74) cannot be the opening of Claim 1, since the Stevens cutting member (52) cannot extend or retract through the opening in end of tube (74).

In other words, if the Examiner contends that end of tube (74) is the claimed opening, it cannot be so since cutting member (52) fails provide any blade that extends and retracts there through, as described in Claim 1. On the other hand, if the Examiner considers the side opening (20) of tube (74) to be the claimed opening, it cannot be so since no guide tube ever extends there though. Accordingly, Stevens does not describe each and every element of Claim 1, since it fails to describe any opening at a shaft's distal end, any guide tube that extends through such opening, and any blade extendable and retractable through such opening, in which the guide tube defines a path for such blade. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 along with its dependent Claims 2-4, 6, 10, and 15-19 be withdrawn.